



NATIONAL LEADERSHIP EDUCATION RESEARCH AGENDA

2013 - 2018

*Providing strategic direction for the
Field of Leadership Education*

“Collaboration is vital to sustain what we call profound or really deep change, because without it, organizations are just overwhelmed by the forces of the status quo.”

- Peter Senge

Suggested Citation

Andenoro, A. C., Allen, S. J., Haber-Curran, P., Jenkins, D. M., Sowcik, M., Dugan, J. P., & Osteen, L. (2013). *National Leadership Education research agenda 2013-2018: Providing strategic direction for the field of leadership education*. Retrieved from Association of Leadership Educators website: <http://leadershipeducators.org/ResearchAgenda>.

Special Thanks

The leadership team would like to provide a very special thanks to Ms. Lauren Bates for her assistance in designing the final report of the National Leadership Education Research. Your time, expertise, and commitment to the field of Leadership Education are sincerely appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1 Preface
- 2 Introduction & Historical Context
- 4 Area I – Pedagogical Priorities – The Applied How of Leadership Education
 - 5 Research Priority I - Teaching, Learning & Curriculum Development
 - 9 Research Priority II - Programmatic Assessment & Evaluation
- 12 Area II – Content-Based Considerations - The Applied What & Who of Leadership Education
 - 13 Research Priority III - The Psychological Development of the Leader, Learner & Follower
 - 16 Research Priority IV - The Sociological Development of the Leader, Learner, & Follower
 - 19 Research Priority V - The Influences of Social Identity
 - 22 Research Priority VI - Social Change & Community Development
 - 25 Research Priority VII - Global & Intercultural Capacity
- 29 The Practical Application of the Agenda & Future Steps
- 31 References
- 42 Acknowledgements

PREFACE

Perspective is a word that is often used to convey meaning for the insight and vision that a particular individual has with respect to a given situation or organization. However, in regards to this document and the efforts that will hopefully stem from it, the idea of perspective goes much deeper. It can be viewed as a collection of thoughts, a synthesis aimed at change and movement, and an extension and transcendence of the singularity that stems from an individual view. It is the synergistic and diverse direction for the empowerment of the field of Leadership Education and the work that informs it.

Competing priorities and an ever-changing landscape of issues create significant challenges for leadership educators as they attempt to develop the next generation of leaders. These challenges provide the impetus for this document and the intentionality behind the perspectives that lie within it. The perspectives within this document offer a synthesis of the materials and ideas that address one central question: What areas of research within the broad context of Leadership Education in higher education should we address in the next five years?

The following perspectives and accompanying priorities serve as a framework to guide the application and practice of Leadership Education scholarship for the next five years across different contexts. The arrow of causality points in both directions for true scholarship, as research should inform teaching and teaching should inform research (Boyer, 1997). Through the enhanced direction achieved by the application of the included research priorities, the field of Leadership Education aims to further define itself as a discipline and more importantly, contribute to the development of leadership prepared to address the complex challenges facing our world.

Our desire is that this document will initiate collaborative dialogue, breakdown interdisciplinary silos, and create trajectory for the work we do as leadership educators.

Anthony C. Andenoro
Project Lead
University of Florida

In the Fall of 2011, the inaugural National Leadership Education Research Agenda was conceived and the Association of Leadership Educators stepped forward to develop a functional and applicable resource to supplement the scholarship informing Leadership Education. This charge was approached with consideration for the critical areas of research to address within the broad context of Leadership Education in higher education and under the auspice of achieving the two overarching goals of the agenda: *1) Provide research priorities that can guide applied scholarship contributing to the development of future leaders and managers through higher education, and 2) Provide key elements that further define Leadership Education as a discipline.*

The following justification and process, as noted by Andenoro (2012, pp. 2-3), provide perspective for why and how the National Leadership Education Research Agenda was developed. Further, the context section establishes a common language and foundation for the agenda's interdisciplinary application.

Justification for the National Leadership Education Research Agenda

When one attempts to define the merits of a discipline, he or she will normally examine the uniqueness of the body of knowledge represented within that discipline. However, this has historically been a difficult proposition for the field of Leadership Education. Primarily the difficulty to define the field lies in the interdisciplinary nature of leadership. Consider that at most universities, one will find some form of Leadership Education being taught in Colleges of Business, Agriculture, Engineering, ROTC/Military Sciences, Education, Liberal Arts, along with multiple departments housed under Student Affairs. This poses challenges for those attempting to define Leadership Education as a discipline, and it also creates an incredible opportunity. Through the diversity of perspectives contained in various academic and co-curricular departments, Leadership Education finds broad transdisciplinary application. The development of the National Leadership Education Research Agenda addresses this opportunity in a manageable and strategic fashion. As the agenda guides the scholarship of Leadership Education as a discipline, it also defines it as a discipline.

Another challenge facing the field of Leadership Education is the general lack of research priorities aimed at guiding the scholarship within field. Although this creates opportunities for diverse publications with broad applications, it decreases the applied nature of the scholarship. Primarily, researchers within Leadership Education continue to ask and attempt to answer the fundamental question "what makes an effective leader?" This is accompanied by the tangible connections to decision-making, ethics, morality, and organizational culture. However, the more important questions facing the field of Leadership Education may include, "who has changed because of this research and how will the research that we do impact those we serve?" The National Leadership Education Research Agenda provides the foundation for increasing the applied nature of the scholarship guiding the development of leadership through higher education.

Process for Development

The challenge of defining the field of Leadership Education is readily apparent. Because of this, it was imperative to provide parameters to the direction that will shape the scholarship within the field. For the first six months of the process, discussions provided critical perspectives relating to past Leadership Education scholarship initiatives led by key scholars at higher education institutions and within Leadership Education organizations. These discussions provided perspectives and parameters that guided the agenda's development

INTRODUCTION

process. We shared our research question with key scholars in the field, Leadership Education organizations, and institutions of higher education that have engaged in collaborative dialogue on the subject.. The emergent themes and perspectives were thoroughly vetted and synthesized with the relevant literature and ultimately resulted in the present document. We believe that the outcomes of the leadership team’s efforts satisfy the original charge of reducing silos and empowering collaborative interdisciplinary networks that provide direction for the field of Leadership Education. The full details of the process can be found at the National Leadership Education Research Agenda Homepage - <http://www.leadershipeducators.org/ResearchAgenda>.

Context for the National Leadership Education Research Agenda

For the perspectives within this document to have practical application, it is important to cultivate a common language for key terms- especially because the terms Leadership Education, Leadership Training, and Leadership Development are often confused and interchanged (Allen and Roberts, 2011; Roberts, 1981). This is not to suggest that multiple perspectives on terminology cannot co-exist, but clarity of intended meaning is essential to advance a cohesive body of scholarship. It is particularly important to clarify the term Leadership Education to aid in the functionality of the research priorities outlined in this agenda.

Leadership Education is the pedagogical practice of facilitating leadership learning in an effort to build human capacity and is informed by leadership theory and research. It values and is inclusive of both curricular and co-curricular educational contexts.

Along with Leadership Training, Leadership Education is a subset of Leadership Development. Defined by Allen and Roberts (2011), Leadership Development is “a continuous, systemic process designed to expand the capacities and awareness of individuals, groups, and organizations in an effort to meet shared goals and objectives” (p. 67). Within this process, Leadership Education specifically focuses on the activities and environments to develop leadership ability (Brungardt, 1997). Although leadership training is typically focused on the preparation of an individual for a specific role or task, Leadership Education is more complex and prepares the individual for future opportunities, roles, and contexts (Roberts, 1981).

Another distinction in terminology is clarifying Leadership Education from leadership studies. For the purposes of this document, Leadership Studies is defined as “a subset of the larger area of Leadership Education.” Leadership Education can include both credit and non credit-bearing leadership programs, whereas Leadership Studies is “an interdisciplinary, academic and applied field of study that focuses on the fluid process and components of the interaction between leaders and followers in a particular context” (Sowcik, 2012, p. 193). As such, leadership studies is often offered through traditional curricular course offerings and may come in the form of a certificate, minor, major, or degree in Leadership Studies (Riggio, Ciulla, and Sorenson, 2003). Leadership studies is used in some contexts to refer to the interdisciplinary knowledge-base from which Leadership Education programs draw their conceptual, theoretical, and empirical grounding.

Area One – Pedagogical Priorities – The Applied How of Leadership Education

As noted earlier, Leadership Education is the pedagogical practice of facilitating leadership learning in an effort to build human capacity and is informed by leadership theory and research. It values and is inclusive of both curricular and co-curricular educational contexts. Inherently, then, Leadership Education is concerned with a focus on teaching and learning. As such, it was critical to establish priorities grounded in the applied how of Leadership Education. The priorities included within this area are inclusive of the essential considerations that inform the learning and transfer of learning through innovative Leadership Education. These priorities are inclusive of, but not limited to the pedagogical and andragogical methods associated with the development of leadership competencies, capacities, and dispositions.



“ People learn deeply by learning to think about the experiences that they have, to compare them with other experiences, frame them in multiple ways, question them, ask what they mean and what implications they have. ” -Ken Bain

PRIORITY ONE: Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum Development

Applied Outcome – Leadership Educators will require an intentional eye for building connections with other streams of research, a better understanding the process of educating for mastery or expertise, and the desire to explore the role of individual differences and social identity within Leadership Education contexts. The following areas are recommended for exploration of teaching, learning and curriculum development.

- **Develop Transdisciplinary Perspectives for Leadership Education** – The intentional development of interdisciplinary connections is essential for the advancement of Leadership Education as a discipline. Disciplines such as instructional and curricular design, program assessment, information processing, student development, competency-based learning, training and development, and educational psychology have the potential to inform our work and can have powerful implications for how leadership educators view teaching and learning associated with Leadership Education.
- **Explore the Capacity & Competency Development Process for the Leadership Education Learner** – Through a deepened understanding of innovative and effective teaching and learning processes, leadership educators have the potential to identify emerging techniques and innovative approaches to teaching. Through a developmental outcomes-based approach to assessment, teaching, and learning within Leadership Education, the development of future generations of leaders is possible.
- **Explore the Role of the Individual Learner in Leadership Education** – Examine how the role of individual differences such as developmental readiness, leadership self-efficacy, motivation to learn, and leadership experience impacts curriculum development, the learners, and instruction in Leadership Education. Further, it is critical to examine how human diversity and social identities impact Leadership Education.
- **Explore Curriculum Development Frameworks to Enhance the Leadership Education Transfer of Learning** – The examination of various curricular and co-curricular designs critically important to the development of curriculum that can positively impact learners. Further, promoting and examining learning environments that are learner-centered, knowledge-centered, assessment-centered, and community centered can provide insight into environments that can support and facilitate curriculum delivery. More evidence in this area will be necessary as leadership educators attempt to propel the field of Leadership Education forward through the development of the learners they serve.

Background/Foundation

Colleges and universities seek to develop students who will be contributing members to society, and many institutions emphasize leadership in their mission statements (Astin and Astin, 2000; Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2012). As such, many leadership initiatives, both curricular and co-curricular, exist on college campuses to facilitate leadership development. We contend that addressing the process of learning and developing leadership is just as, if not more, important than addressing the curricular topics of Leadership Education.

Traditional instructional methods and pedagogical models used in higher education are often transactional and hierarchical in nature, with a greater emphasis on “teaching delivery rather than on student learning” (Shepherd and Cogsgriff, 1998, p. 349). In addition, traditional lecture-based teaching can often result in a gap between the content and how it translates to practice. In other words, students often “fail to develop the full battery of skills and abilities desired in a contemporary college graduate” (Duch, Groh, and Allen, 2001, p. 4). This gap is particularly troubling for the discipline of Leadership Education, which strongly emphasizes practice and the development of skills and capacities in addition to basic conceptual understanding (Conger, 1992). Likewise, Leadership Education involves the development of declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge (Schraw, 1998) and emphasizes learning goals that focus more on application and integration than foundational knowledge (Jenkins, 2012a). As innovative and learner-centered pedagogical approaches are being used in the field of Leadership Education, empirical research on such approaches is needed to gain more useful knowledge beyond utilization (e.g., Allen and Hartman, 2009; Barr and Tagg, 1995; Conger, 1992; Jenkins, 2012b; Jenkins, 2013) and instead on effective and engaging ways of teaching that meet educational objectives.

Scholars have contended that leadership is developmental and a lifelong endeavor (Avolio, 2005; Day, Harrison and Halpin, 2009). Accordingly, we must seek to understand the individual differences of students and match appropriate learning opportunities to assist in their development. To address this deficiency in instruction, leadership educators should connect curricular decisions with moral, psychosocial, identity, and cognitive student development theories. It is critical to design programming that match our students’ dispositions, learning styles, and psycho- and physiological needs.

Challenges

Leadership Education initiatives are burgeoning on college campuses (Dugan and Komives, 2007). Although this truth presents opportunities to create informed and civically engaged critical leaders, it also creates challenges with regards to instructional and curricular design, consistency, and assessment. Higher education has an opportunity to design and develop best practice leadership programs and cutting edge teaching, learning, and assessment.

- **Embrace & Develop the Transdisciplinary Nature of Leadership Education** – Leadership is an interdisciplinary topic and leadership educators can learn valuable lessons from biology, anthropology, sociology, psychology, philosophy, the humanities, and a number of others areas of inquiry. To develop a transformative learning experience, a program architect may look to any number of research streams to help develop a “best in class” learning experience. For instance, the field of training and development provides valuable insight into topics such as learning transfer and learner readiness (Kirwan and Birchall, 2006). In addition, streams of research in psychology such as information processing (Lord and Maher, 2001) and cognition (Gagne, 1970) are important to better understand the learning process. Furthermore, other streams such as service learning (Steiner and Watson, 2006), management development (D’Netto, Bakas, and Bordia, 2008), and educational psychology (Marzano and Kendall, 2007) provide valuable insight to program architects and expand our current methods of educating leaders.
- **Establish Processes for Developing Leadership Competency & Capacity in Learners** – Although the exploration of taxonomies of learning (Bloom, 1956; Fink 2003) and proximal development (Chaiklin, 2003; Vygotsky, 1962) have been explored in depth in other disciplines such as mathematics (Cobb, 1988) and language development/reading (Chomsky, 1972), research exploring the developmental nature of leadership is just beginning to emerge (e.g., Day, Harrison, and Halpin, 2009; Lord and Hall, 2005). The

developmental stages of leader and leadership development critically impact the content of Leadership Education. Accordingly, research that expands our base of knowledge regarding effective instructional and curricular design must align with these important areas of inquiry. Likewise, providing educational opportunities that help an individual progress from novice to expert is an important area of focus (Allen and Middlebrooks, 2013; Lord and Hall, 2005). Opportunities must be identified to facilitate deliberate practice (Ericsson, Krampe, Tesch-Römer, 1993) in an ongoing and intentional manner. As Riggio (2008) suggests, “the practice of leadership, just like the practice of medicine, or law, or any other profession, is a continual learning process” (p. 387).

Opportunities

Leadership Educators need to learn more about assessment of our efforts (Riggio, 2008); more specifically, the appropriate research methods, paradigms, and data collection procedures. As in much of contemporary social science research, there is paradigm debate in leadership about how knowledge is created and the dimensions by which we understand it (Kellerman, 2012). Accordingly, we suggest a multi- and mixed-methods approach to extricating innovative pedagogy and curriculum development in Leadership Education research. Both quantitative and qualitative methods have much to offer. Accordingly, we offer the following research methods with respect to impending research questions while keeping in mind that all research methods have strengths and weaknesses and the following suggest only a sample of approaches researchers could employ to address the scope of this research agenda.

- **Longitudinal Studies** – To understand the long-term effects of Leadership Education upon student behaviors and learning outcomes, research is needed that follows students in leadership programs (Day, 2011; Riggio and Mumford, 2011). In addition, studies that address programs with differing approaches to Leadership Education, sequencing of curricula, unique pedagogies, learning communities, and environments might address this area of inquiry most directly.
- **Experimental Studies** – Because students who select Leadership Education often differ from those who do not participate in leadership curricula (Owen, 2012), it is critical to test alternative models of Leadership Education, the use of technology, innovative pedagogy, and individual differences through the use of controlled experimental designs. Such information is also important to educational and institutional policy makers.
- **Qualitative Approaches to Inquiry** – Conger (1998) noted the critical nature of qualitative research aimed at identifying the feelings and perceptions that inform leadership practice. Although it was published 15 years ago, it is still relevant, timely, and essential to Leadership Education. To fully understand the leader, follower, and learner, it is essential to gain holistic perspective of their feelings and perceptions. The inherent depth that is necessary to provide an understanding for that holistic perspective is grounded in naturalistic inquiry and the qualitative research paradigm. Accordingly, it is important to engage in research methods that collect rich data on student and faculty experiences in Leadership Education such as learning and programmatic outcomes, curricular and co-curricular learning environments, and the effectiveness of instructional and assessment strategies.
- **Grounded Theory** – Grounded theory studies such as those by Komives, Owen, Longersbeam, Mainella, and Osteen (2005) and Jenkins and Cutchens (2011) provide examples of generated theory from constant

and comparative inquiry (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Accordingly, a great deal can be learned about student learning and developmental processes through grounded theory.

- **Narrative Research** – Narrative research begins with experiences as expressed in lived and told stories of individuals (Creswell, 2013). For example, Shamir, Dayan-Horesh, and Adler (2005) suggest a “life-story approach” to studying leadership. Arguably, leadership development could be portrayed through research that captures individuals’ progression through curricular and/or co-curricular Leadership Education programs.
- **Phenomenological Studies** – Whereas narrative research reports the experiences of a single or several individuals, a phenomenological study describes the common meaning for several individuals of their lived experience of a concept or phenomenon (Creswell, 2013). Research that uncovers common meanings with respect to specific instructional strategies, programmatic outcomes, and experiences offer an opportunity for greater clarity for the field of Leadership Education.
- **Case Studies** – Case study research involves the study of a case within a real-life contemporary context or setting (Yin, 2009). Case studies could utilize best practices at leading programs that illustrate the work that leadership educators do, the dilemmas they face, and the contexts within which they work. They also facilitate the examination of Leadership Education from a variety of conceptual, theoretical, and analytical perspectives, and provide high-quality, research-based instructional materials for use in formal courses and professional development workshops.
- **Ethnographic Studies** – Ethnography focuses on an entire culture-sharing group (Creswell, 2013). The cultural implications of these studies provide transferable perspectives that lead to opportunities for the understanding and development of diverse contexts.
- **Action Research/Action Inquiry** – Questions of student learning outcomes with respect to leadership behaviors might best be answered by action research (AR). These studies could use AR methods as well as historical and archival data and focus on collaborative inquiry, best practices with respect to pedagogy and learner development, and the preparation of leadership educators. Action research/action inquiry is also beneficial for leadership educators in examining their own role as an educator in order to improve their Leadership Education practice (e.g. Tillapaugh and Haber-Curran, in press).
- **Observational or Natural Setting Studies** – The question of how the process of Leadership Education is experienced can be addressed by observational studies, which have the promise of discovering the nature of the experience of leadership and learning. Leadership educators can deepen their understanding of Leadership Education contexts by observing students and instructors, along with their divergent pedagogies, assessments, practices, and methods.

PRIORITY TWO: Programmatic Assessment and Evaluation

Applied Outcome – Leadership educators and program administrators will need greater understanding of the differences that exist among leadership programs, the programmatic assessment processes, and the availability, utility, application, and implementation of programmatic assessment resources. The following areas are recommended for exploration with respect to the programmatic assessment and evaluation of Leadership Education.

- **Increase Understanding of Leadership Program Differences** – It is critically important to examine the overt and subtle differences among leadership learning contexts. Through an enhanced understanding of program diversity, Leadership Educators will be more adept at understanding how to empower the development of those we serve.
- **Establish Collaborative Capacity for Programmatic Assessment** – A deeper understanding of outcome-based assessment plans for Leadership Education programs will provide leadership educators with the potential to design intentional curriculum aimed at the development of Leadership Education learners. This is critically important to achieving depth that builds learner capacity and extends beyond traditional competency-based leadership development curriculum.
- **Explore Shared Standards for Leadership Programs** – An examination of factors commonly associated with accreditation and best practices for leadership programs provide leadership educators insight into the development of quality Leadership Education programs.
- **Assess Viable Programmatic Assessment Resources** – As the leadership issues facing organizations become more complex, there will be a need to examine existing resources and develop innovative materials to assess leadership programs.

Background/Foundation

Assessment and feedback is needed in order for Leadership Education programs to further develop, adapt, and grow. Yet, there is little disciplinary consensus with respect to formative programmatic assessment. Without consensus in this area, ambiguity permeates leading to a lack of program accountability and direction.

To create a culture of accountability within Leadership Education, clear and intentional inquiry focused on programmatic assessment is necessary. Accordingly, research is needed to ensure that leadership educators and program administrators understand the differences that exist within Leadership Education, the necessity to engage in assessment, and the resources needed to do so.

The topic of formalized program review (e.g., external reviews, certification, accreditation) has emerged as a hot topic in recent years. In the summer of 2011, an International Leadership Association (ILA) task force was formed with the mission to explore questions concerning external review processes and offer

recommendations related to formalized leadership program review (Sowcik, Lindsey, and Rosch, 2013). Two outcomes have come from this work to date. First, the task force presented recommendations to Chair of the International Leadership Association Board of Directors. Secondly, results from the task force findings and other perspectives on formalized program review were published in a special symposium of *Journal for Leadership Studies* titled “Exploring the legitimacy, maturity, and accountability of leadership studies programs: A movement towards ‘good’ practices?” (Sowcik, 2013).

Challenges

As complex adaptive systems, Leadership Education programs need feedback to further develop, adapt, and grow. However, some of the major challenges to programmatic assessment can be summed up by the following statement: “We fail to grasp the essence of leadership that is relevant to modern age and hence we cannot agree even on standards by which to measure, recruit, and reject it” (Burns, 1995, p. 9). The following considerations address the needs associated with the evaluation and assessment of Leadership Education programs.

- **Explore Formalized Program Review & Shared Standards for Leadership Programs** – There are a general lack of agreed upon standards that promote quality and accountability for Leadership Education programs. However the bigger questions lie within realms of who should determine the standards and evaluate the programs, and what should be taught within these programs. It is also critical to consider the potential benefits against the potential costs of establishing a set of standards for Leadership Education. There is a need for a system of standards to promote quality Leadership Education practice, without infringing on the creativity and autonomy of leadership educators essential to innovative teaching and learning.
- **Develop Means for Leadership Education Monitoring & Evaluation** – Programmatic monitoring and evaluation are critical for leadership educators to consider as they attempt to determine if their practice is achieving the desired outcomes. However, there is a deficiency in the research and resources aimed at addressing this need. Possible explanations are the overwhelming workload many leadership educators face (Ewell, 2009) and “many institutions simply do not know...how to implement evidence-based continuous improvement” (Goertzen, 2013, p. 56). Over the next few years, it will become increasingly important to encourage open dialogue and collaborative research efforts that develop methods of monitoring and evaluation to create formative, summative, and developmental processes to establish a standard of quality for Leadership Education programs.

Opportunities

There is momentum in the field to address assessment on all levels (.i.e., student, course, program, and institutional). There are many recent examples of new initiatives concerning Leadership Education/ Studies Assessment (e.g., Jenkins, Freed, Hoover, and Satterwhite, 2012; Ritch, 2013; Sowcik, 2013). Although this area of inquiry is growing, little consensus exists in the evaluation of such options. Accordingly, we suggest a multi- and mixed-methods approach to evaluating currently available assessment models. These models would provide data to enhance models and develop an interdisciplinary understanding of leadership programs within higher education institutions. We also recommend greater emphasis on institutional and programmatic accountability. It would be wise for those within the field of Leadership Education to reach out to other established academic disciplines to better understand assessment practices. Having an opportunity

THE PRIORITIES

to learn from a multitude of disciplines and replicate effective assessment practices will provide an increased opportunity for effective and innovative assessment practices. This collaborative approach prioritizes learning from the successes and failures of our interdisciplinary colleagues and provides an interdisciplinary application for unique Leadership Education contexts.

Area Two – Content Based Priorities – The Applied What and Who of Leadership Education

In addition to exploring the pedagogical priorities identified previously, it is critical to consider the content and the learner within the Leadership Education context. Without considerable perspective for these areas, effective transfer of learning is far less likely to occur. Because of this, it was paramount to establish priorities grounded in the applied what and who of Leadership Education. The following research priorities are inclusive of the essential considerations that inform our understanding of the leadership learner and content aimed at developing competencies, capacities, and dispositions for practicing leadership. These priorities are applicable to personal, organizational, community, and global contexts.



“ True learning does not occur unless reflection is present. ” -John Dewey

PRIORITY THREE: The Psychological Development of Leaders, Followers, and Learners

Applied Outcome – Leadership Education is critically grounded in the psychological development of those that it is created to impact. The psychological roots of Leadership Education provide a critical foundation for higher-level organizational development and leadership practice. Although this is a foundational element of the Leadership Education landscape, the intricacies of personality and self-awareness, along with other variables, require continued development and additional research that will provide perspective for leadership educators tasked with preparing the next generation of leaders. The following areas are recommended for exploration with respect to the psychological development of leaders, followers, and learners.

- **Development of Leader, Follower, and Learner Psychological Capacity** – Leaders, followers, and those who aspire to serve others need to develop perspective for self within the group and organizational context. Specifically, the following constructs, the development of capacity for them, and their broad based contextualization provide a powerful foundation for the learner. This list is not meant to be exclusive, as this is an emergent area with the field of Leadership Education.
 - Self-Awareness, Emotional Intelligence, Emotional Intelligent Leadership, Critical Leadership, Aversion and Propensity for Change, Motivation and Initiatives in Leadership Contexts, Self-Esteem for Leadership Practice, Personality, Personal Hardiness, Trust, Creativity, Self-Agreement, Self-control, Self-Sacrifice, and Empowerment
- **Development of Moral and Ethical Foundations for Leadership Practice** – Intentionally separated, the constructs of morality and ethics provide grounding and purposiveness for leadership practice. However most leadership programs often only provide a cursory snapshot of the moral and ethic foundations necessary for leaders and followers to be successful (Andenoro, 2005; Andenoro, Murphrey, & Dooley, 2008). Through intentionally designed research initiatives aimed at the understanding and development of these elements in learners, our society gains a foothold for supporting our organizations and the communities and people they serve.
- **Development of Critical and Creative Thinking Disposition and the Accompanying Self-Efficacy to Demonstrate Action** – Leaders, followers, and learners are faced with a constantly changing organizational landscape and a painfully insufficient set of standard operating procedures to address every challenge within that landscape. This causes them to leap beyond conventional wisdom and create innovative measures to address complex problems with respect to diverse stakeholders. Through the development of critical and creative thinking dispositions and the strategically aligned initiatives, and self-efficacy to act upon those dispositions, individuals are offered a greater opportunity to empower self-development and organizational growth.

Background/Foundation

Since the times of Socrates and Plato and the advent of Great Man Theory, the impetus for leadership has been placed on the personal characteristics of those leading. Throughout the early years of leadership and Leadership Education, theorists excessively studied the idea of charisma and other personal traits that could potentially hold the key to effective leadership. These studies provided a cursory understanding of which individuals have the potential for leadership. Early studies did little to include the concept of the followers or the context in the leadership equation. Although this perspective may sound elementary and fairly pedestrian, it provides a critical foundation for Leadership Education stressing the importance of the individual in the leadership equation, but they were limited in scope with only focusing on this. Thus, it not only provides the justification for individualized Leadership Education, but also the inclusion and development of the leadership educator as a catalytic piece of the leadership learning process.

With time, leadership research began to recognize the role of other people and the context. This can be seen in the behavioral, situational, reciprocal, and influence theories on leadership (Komives, Lucas, and McMahon, 2013). Capacity and disposition rose to the forefront and depth developed with respect to the intricacies of the human psyche and the inherent complexity of relationships. Through heightened self-awareness, the development of critical and creative thinking disposition as well capacity for self-efficacy, the learner gains the potential to not only understand the application of quality leadership practice, but to share its application and instill it in others.

Further, the understanding of self is essential to the development of positive relationships within social situations. Hence the psychological development of the learner, leader, and follower is necessary for the understanding of influence, which is a central component of leadership. Further this priority identifies that emergent leadership theories should recognize that leadership is not only about a single person. Leadership is a process stemming from a relationship with others fostered through self-awareness and an understanding for context.

Challenges

Although this priority is critically important to the development of the field of Leadership Education and those that it serves, there are several challenges necessary for consideration. The following provide several considerations aimed at a more holistic inclusion of psychologically based constructs within the field of Leadership Education.

- **The Depth of the Human Psyche** – The vastness of the human psyche and the underlying perspectives, feelings, and passions present within each individual, makes quantification and generalization of the learners extremely difficult. However, this should not be an excuse for exploring these perspectives, as they are fundamental to our understanding of leadership as a process. Research should be directed at gathering baseline data that provides perspectives of the learners and their cognitive and developmental capacities for personal growth and awareness. This includes the expansion of traditional student identity development theory, leadership capacity, authentic practice, relationship-based practice, influence, persuasion, interpersonal communication, and related items.
- **Investment in Critical Self-Reflection** – The development of leadership educators and learners requires greater attention toward critical self-reflection (CSR). Reflection is often a hallmark practice in Leadership Education focused on evaluative reasoning and critical thinking (Jenkins, 2012; Jenkins and Cutchens,

THE PRIORITIES

2011; Roberts, 2008). However, Preskill and Brookfield (2009) advocate for a move toward CSR, which goes beyond typical reflection to interrogate assumptions related to power and hegemony that underlie leadership issues. CSR is a learnable skill, but one that must be purposefully developed (Densten and Gray, 2001; Preskill and Brookfield, 2009). Significant attention should be directed at shifting forms of reflection to take on more critical dimensions while also exploring the mechanisms for cultivating it.

- **Educator Capacity** – With respect to the previous challenges, it is also critical for research to illuminate perspectives that help educators navigate these tumultuous waters judiciously and efficiently. Due to the depths of the human psyche and the underlying perspectives, feelings, and passions present within each individual, it is critical that the leadership educator is fully prepared for what her or she may encounter through this educational process. Often times the proverbial Pandora’s box of feelings and emotions within the learner can be opened by the educator’s incisive questioning. Understanding that all leadership educators are not trained psychologists, it is paramount for applied research to yield developmental curriculum and best practices aimed at building an educators’ toolkit replete with the necessary skills to fully facilitate the leadership learning process.
- **Time and Intentionality** – Leadership educators are tasked with serving an increasing diversity and varied perspectives among leadership learners. Intentionality becomes paramount, seeing as an individual growth plan complete with distinctive learning objective is not possible for every learner within an educator’s learning environment. Hence, it is suggested that research focuses on alternative viewpoints, processes, and assessments aimed at encouraging self-reflection and self-guided growth for the learners.

Opportunities

The significant challenges associated with this priority also align with tremendous opportunities for leadership educators and researchers addressing this priority. This priority informs research in two main areas. First, there is an ever growing dynamic within corporate and co-curricular leadership development contexts that prioritize understanding the psychology of the individual with respect to group and organizational dynamics. While copious amounts of time, energy, and finances have been devoted to understanding personalities and the interpersonal traits of those within our organizations through strengths, personality, communication style, and leadership style assessments, there is a severe need to unpack the formative foundations that contributed to these identified characteristics. Through extended depth and understanding of those that work with our organizations, the potential exists for more intentional group development and the empowerment of strategic delegation based on employees’ strengths, competencies, commitments, attitudes, and dispositions. Research efforts grounded in a more substantial understanding of the psychology for leaders, followers, and learners create tremendous possibilities that should guide future Leadership Education and practice.

PRIORITY FOUR: The Sociological Development of Leaders, Followers, and Learners

Applied Outcome – Humans by nature are social beings who seek social interactions to establish pleasure and reduce pain. This fundamental element of the human psyche becomes the foundation for leadership practice. This priority examines the essential function of the individual within the group context and reflects the critical relationship that exists between leaders and followers as well as between instructors and learners of leadership. This priority builds upon the previous priority and establishes a firm application of the individual within the group, team, and organizational contexts. The following areas are recommended for exploration with respect to the sociological development of leaders, followers, and learners.

- **Development of Learning Organizations** – For organizations to understand the cultures that drive them, support the diversity of their members, and fully commit to the acknowledgement and examination of the issues they face, significant learning opportunities must be prioritized. The idea of the learning organization promotes intentionality for creating knowledge and learning opportunities as well as developing coping mechanisms to allow for change and innovative practice (Senge, 1997). Although Senge’s perspectives were written more than 16 years ago, their adaptation to leadership learning has been relatively gradual. This priority promotes and encourages leadership educators and scholars to explore the potential for creative contexts, innovative practice, and holistic learning across organization hierarchies. It validates and builds upon the existing literature recognizing that leadership transcends the individual through its fundamental grounding as a systems phenomenon (Lichtenstein, Uhl-Bien, Marion, Seers, Orton, and Schreiber, 2006; Marion and Uhl-Bien, 2003; Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey, 2004). This forms the foundation for creating solutions to the problems that organizations face and organization sustainability through times of adversity.
- **Developing the Leader, Follower, and Learner with Respect to Addressing Complex Adaptive Systems** – Leadership does not operate in a vacuum. It is a process that impacts organizations and the people and structures within them. Yukl and Mahsud (2010) note that flexible and adaptive leadership involves changing behavior appropriately to positively impact situational dynamics and organizational change. Further, approaching leadership through a systems perspective recognizes the interconnected levels of the individual, group, organization, and larger system (Heifetz and Linsky, 2002). The complexities that impact the ability to be adaptive and manage the systemic nature of leadership within organizations requires more empirical research. Through a purposeful examination of organizational

Background/Foundation

Group dynamics have resided at the forefront of Leadership Education since the inception of leadership, and the application of sociology-based perspectives creates a foundation for our understanding of them. However, as Heifetz and Laurie (1997) noted, “solutions to adaptive challenges reside not in the executive suite but in the collective intelligence of employees at all levels” (p. 124). Thus, leadership educators need innovative research to address the development of adaptive leadership learning that can be promoted at all levels of the organization. Popular theories of the past, such as transformational leadership (Bass, 1985) and charismatic leadership (Conger, 1989), have addressed this idea attempting to explore how leaders impact

THE PRIORITIES

followers within organizational contexts. Although past theoretical foundations provide us with perspective, they are only valuable to a point. Popular leadership theories of the past often fail to explain the leaders' influence on collective learning and can distract attention from the most important influence processes (Yukl, 2009). Yukl (2009) suggests, "instead of trying to extend dyadic theories of leadership to explain organization-level processes, it is much better to develop new conceptual frameworks that are more relevant and comprehensive" (p. 50).

Although we understand that traditional, hierarchical views of leadership are marginally useful considering the overwhelming complexities of our social systems (Lichtenstein et al., 2006), we also understand that the research and scholarship that govern the development of leadership theory must also transition to new perspectives. This shift will allow for perspective to be gained addressing complex and often convoluted adaptive needs of organizations (Lichtenstein et al., 2006). Two specific areas that provide a foundation for this scholarship lie in the examination of adaptive and complexity leadership theories.

Grounded in the roots of contingency theories (e.g., Fiedler, 1964, House, 1971; Hersey and Blanchard, 1984; Vroom and Jago, 1988), adaptive leadership involves changing behavior in appropriate ways as the situation changes (Yukl and Mahud, 2010). Intuitively, adaptive leadership creates a foundation for leaders to address complex adaptive systems within organizations. It is linked to five key concepts: complexity, adaptability, leadership, paradox, and uncertainty (Obolensky, 2010). Through the understanding and application of these concepts, leaders and followers can begin to engage within the organizational context in a powerful and potentially transformational way. Although this form of leadership has the potential to positively impact growth within organizational contexts, further research is warranted to address the "considerable ambiguity in the management and leadership literature about the nature of flexible [and adaptive] leadership" (Yukl and Mahud, 2010, p. X).

Concurrently, complexity leadership theory extends beyond an individual's potential and prioritizes collective ventures aimed at creating efficiency for organizational processes (Drath, 2001; Lichtenstein et al., 2006). While grounded in the past literature, which values the individuals' leadership traits and characteristics, this priority goes beyond reestablishing leadership as an event (Lichtenstein et al., 2006) and suggesting an empowerment strategy of distributed leadership (Brown and Gioia, 2002; Gronn, 2002). This forms a foundation for dynamic organizational practice and prioritizes the idea of a learning organization. Research that generates perspectives about the intricacies of this has the potential to contribute to increased understanding of organizational dynamics and prevent the realization of Argyris and Schon's (1978) contention that the demise of an organization is often indelibly linked to its failure to adapt to the complex challenges it faces.

Challenges

The challenges that should thoughtfully be addressed with respect to this priority are somewhat intuitive. They address the systemic complexity and dynamic cultures impacting our organizations. The following challenges provide several considerations reflecting the inclusion of sociological based constructs with respect to the field of Leadership Education.

- **Diversity of Learners** – It is critical to consider the diversity of the learners within the educational context. Learners will have a variety of backgrounds that marginally prepare them or possibly severely underprepare them for analyzing organizational culture and dynamics with respect to strategic change and

the development of practices consistent with learning organizations. This challenge will call for a renewed focus on the development of the leadership educator in an effort to create the best possible learning context. Tangible examples that focus on this development will be not only be considered valuable, but essential, as leadership educators attempt to frame content in manageable, practical, and developmental examples. Complex adaptive systems thinking will need to be cultivated within learners through the educational initiatives that elevate the learners' thinking to higher levels of Bloom's Taxonomy (Krathwohl, 2002).

- **Changing Organizational Dynamics** – Diverse members, competing internal agendas, and opposing power structures create a challenging environment for the leaders and followers within organizations. Significant time should be devoted to understanding the impact that these can have on the overall organizational trajectory. Research into the cause and effect relationships among these factors has the potential to serve as a form of collective learning within given organizations (Yukl, 2009) that could establish long-term sustainability.
- **Complex External Factors** – It was noted earlier that leadership does not operate in a vacuum. As such, organizations are impacted by the daily ebb and flow of the markets and stakeholders on which they depend. As Heifetz and Laurie (1997) suggest, “Changes in societies, markets, customers, competition, and technology around the globe are forcing organizations to clarify their values, develop new strategies, and learn new ways of operating” (p. 124). Heifetz and Laurie (1997) further address this describing the difficulty that leaders face as they attempt to affect change and mobilize organizational constituents to perform complex and adaptive tasks. This will be a daunting challenge for leadership educators as they attempt to prepare learners to empower a competitive advantage for work within domestic and global markets.

Opportunities

It is clear that traditional means of Leadership Education will not meet the needs of leaders, followers, and learners within higher education contexts. However, the landscape is rich with opportunities that will hopefully contribute to perspectives that shape future organizational practice. Learners are eager to have real-world opportunities where they can gain valuable work experience and procedural knowledge that will prepare them for future leadership and give them a competitive advantage over other graduates applying for similar positions. This provides researchers access to previously unexplored populations and encourages the development of undergraduate and graduate student research skills. Educational efforts that promote effective and innovative means of engaging learners in research-based activities within organizational contexts could provide tremendous potential for transferability and replication across the curriculum. External organizations are also looking for collaborative partnerships with curricular and co-curricular programs that will provide them with access to the next generation of leaders. These collaborative opportunities create mutually beneficial scenarios for leadership programs and the external organizations.

PRIORITY FIVE: Influences of Social Identity

Applied Outcome – Leadership scholars and educators should more effectively center considerations of social identity in leadership research, education, and practice. This includes clear attention to marginalized voices and ideas, an understanding of the socio-historic and contextual influences of organizational environments on leadership development, and the use of asset-based and agency-focused approaches to research that situate social identity as a key variable of influence. In an effort to better align Leadership Education with principles of contemporary leadership theories emphasizing inclusion, social justice, and equity, the following areas are recommended for exploration with respect to the understanding of learner, leader, and follower social identity.

- **Examining Social Identity in Leadership Content** – It is imperative to encourage the development of perspectives from a diverse author base that reflects the diversity of the learners, leaders, and followers impacted by Leadership Education. Through a broadening of the perspectives within the literature, biases can be removed and a critical and intersectional approach to research, theory, and practice has the potential to reshape what is known about leadership.
- **Examining Social Identity in Leadership Pedagogy** – Considerations for the unique needs of varying social identity groups related to effective pedagogical approaches and educational interventions are necessary. Specifically, these include how socio-historic and contextual factors shape the needs of marginalized identity groups impacted by Leadership Education, how interactions within and across social identity groups cultivate opportunities for Leadership Education, and how power and authority structures privilege and constrain the ways individuals engage with, experience, and learn from Leadership Education and the outcomes associated with it.
- **Examining Social Identity in Leadership Research** – More time and resources should be devoted to adequately capturing perspectives associated with social identity and their application to Leadership Education research methods. Considerations for sampling procedures that disaggregated analyses by social identity groups to examine conditional effects and asset-based approaches are warranted. Through the application of research that moves beyond simple examinations of perceptual and enactment differences in leadership based on social identity to more complex treatments that address the social realities of identity in leadership, leadership educators can gain a more holistic and meaningful impression of the audiences they serve.

Background/Foundation

Attention to the role of social identity in leadership is hardly a new emphasis as scholars have stressed its importance considerably. However, the majority of this work explores associations with traditional leader/follower prototypes, organizational and work team identities, or nationality and cultural differences (Day, Harrison, and Halpin, 2009; Dorfman and House, 2004; Hogg, 2001; Lord and Hall, 2005; Pittinsky, 2010; van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, De Cremer, Hogg, 2004). Much of the focus in leadership studies and Leadership Education is placed on organization and cultural influences on leadership. Overlooking individuals'

social identities as another key influence on leadership provides a significant oversight and gap in the research. Eagly and Chin (2010) note the troubling omission or segregation of content related to domestic social identities from leadership literature. Omission and segregation become tools to reinforce a dominant literature or master narrative that often excludes the voices of socio-historically marginalized communities (Ayman and Korabik, 2010; Dugan, 2011; Eagly and Chin, 2010; Ospina and Foldy, 2009). These narratives are replicated both intentionally and unintentionally over time contributing to a body of scholarship and leadership prototype that by its very construction may be distancing (Munin and Dugan, 2011). Scholars suggest the critical need to revisit leadership theory to examine the ways in which it perpetuates dominant norms and fails to fully represent social identity differences present in society (Ayman and Korabik, 2010; Fassinger, Shullman, and Stevenson, 2010; Ospina and Foldy, 2009).

Of the domestic social identity differences present in the United States, gender has received the most substantive attention, although scholars note there remains significant work to be done (Eagly and Carli, 2007; Eagly and Chin, 2010). Lesser attention has been directed toward considerations associate with race/ethnicity and sexual orientation. Nevertheless, emerging evidence from the limited existing research is clear that considerations associated with domestic social identities are associated with differential perceptions of leadership, engagement in leadership experiences, processes of leadership development, and enactment of leadership behaviors (e.g., Arminio et al., 2000; Dugan, Kodama, and Gebhardt, 2012; Kezar and Moriarty, 2000; Kodama and Dugan, 2013; Renn, 2007). Thus, when scholars and researchers center social identity in their research, not surprisingly results emerge that highlight the significant ways in which differences frame leadership development.

Challenges

For leadership educators to effectively construct learning experiences that address the need of all learners as well as prepare individuals to work in complex and diverse contexts, a more fully realized research agenda is needed that addresses influences of social identity. Addressing influences of social identity presents a number of challenges, which include: explicit preparation and on-going learning for leadership educators, investment in critical self-reflection, willingness to critically examine existing literature, and the integration of new approaches to research. The following challenges provide several considerations addressing social identity within the field of Leadership Education.

- **Preparation of Leadership Educators** – Limited attention has been directed toward the requisite skills of those designing and delivering Leadership Education programs. A vast array of disciplinary backgrounds that may or may not have adequately prepared individuals with direct content and pedagogical knowledge regarding leadership situates continuing education as critical (Owens, 2012). Education associated with multicultural competence, critical approaches to research and theory building, and understanding the influences of social identity must begin with leadership educators (Munin and Dugan, 2011). Mabey (2012) suggests that a critical approach “requires those who are conducting leadership development to consider how their own leadership identities are being constituted and maintained, and to apply these criticisms to themselves as facilitators” (p. 14). Prior to working with students around issues of social identity, educators must commit deeply to their own ongoing development.
- **Integration of New Approaches to Research** – The ability to advance substantive research on the influences of social identity on leadership also necessitates a diversity of research approaches. It is not

THE PRIORITIES

surprising that issues of social identity remain invisible when research does not ask about them to begin with, employs design approaches that inherently minimize them, and/ or use analytic techniques that cannot detect them. Researchers are encouraged to use critical theory and intersectionality as research design frameworks that center the concern for social identities. The inclusion of diverse samples and appropriate variables is also essential. Dugan, Kodama, and Gebhardt (2012) suggest, for example, that studies of race and leadership often use racial group membership to examine influences rather than the more potent and influential variable of racial identity. Similar claims can be made across other social identity groups. The sophistication of research approaches must reflect the complex nature of social identities if scholars wish to better understand its influences on leadership development.

- **Exploring Individual Differences and Social Identity within Leadership Education** – As noted in priority one, effective educational programs consider the individual differences of their learners. , Thus it is imperative that attention is paid to individual differences as they relate to the social identities of learners. Learners' experiences and ways of learning and developing vary based on their backgrounds and social identities including gender identity, race/ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and disability (Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005). Further, the research on student leadership development suggests that social identity influences students' leadership behavior and development (Dugan and Komives, 2007; Dugan, Komives, and Segar, 2008; Haber, 2012; Kezar and Moriarty, 2000; Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, and Osteen, 2005; Romano, 1996). In order to anticipate these differences and better understand as well as serve diverse students of Leadership Education, researchers should situate social identities within research on Leadership Education (Astin, 1997; Pascarella, 2006; Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005).

Opportunities

Advancing the proposed research agenda requires the ability to directly name and address difficult issues associated with power, authority, and privilege. Doing so presents numerous challenges most associated with reframing our approaches to Leadership Education. Although this may appear daunting in scope, the potential rewards are numerous. More effectively addressing issues of social identity in leadership presents an opportunity to address critiques from the public and private sectors that individuals do not enter the workforce with adequate competency in engaging across difference. It also addresses the calls for a more diverse workforce better prepared to address the complex leadership issues facing society. Perhaps most important, addressing the influences of social identity on Leadership Education represents an opportunity to bring into better alignment the espoused and actualized values of this critical work. A more in depth understanding of leader, follower, and learner social identity will contribute to a more representative, complex, and rich literature base as well as a more effective, efficient, and targeted approach to the design of Leadership Education.

PRIORITY SIX: Social Change and Community Development

Applied Outcome – Ultimately, our charge as leadership educators is to prepare future leaders to positively impact national and international communities. This priority is intimately linked to that effort with respect to the dynamic variability and systemic complexity of community development. In an effort to promote healthy and sustainable social change, it is critically important to address the historical foundations and the interdisciplinary application of diverse theoretical perspectives. This includes but is not limited to the theoretical foundations specifically aimed at social change and the development of vibrant and resilient communities. The following areas are recommended for exploration of social change and community development.

- **Examine Innovative Implications for and Application of Social Change Leadership** – The ever-changing dynamics associated with organizations and their implications for the communities they serve merit a reexamination of the key assumptions of the Social Change Model of Leadership (Higher Education Research Institute, 1996) and other key social change frameworks. Through intentional research efforts aimed at emphasizing applied practice and research with tangible implications, leadership educators open the possibility for heightened capacity for change management and empowerment of organizational and community development.
- **Contextualization of Self & The Other** – Through a deepened understanding of social change and community development, learners have the ability to understand themselves and the change they wish to enable. Perspective for positive change, interpersonal morality, and organizational ethics help to shape the leadership framework that creates relationships essential to transformational learning within organizational and community contexts.
- **Development of Vibrant & Resilient Communities** – Communities are facing considerable challenges and complexity. Globalization, the economic downturn, competing priorities, increased human diversity, climate change, and the rapid expansion of technology have caused communities and the people within them to change or face significant hardships. However, human nature often resists change in an effort to hold onto the comforts and control of past initiatives. Thus, it will be critical for leadership scholars and educators to create research lines that will address the development of these communities, the cultures within them, and ultimately their sustainability and resiliency during adversity-filled times.

Background/Foundation

In 1996, the Higher Education Research Institute introduced the Social Change Model of Leadership. Its values-based application to individuals, groups, and communities, along with its grounding within the perspectives of prominent theorists, including Burns (1978) and Rost (1993), made the theory a foundational pillar in the Leadership Education community. Many curricular and co-curricular entities across higher education adopted the model and almost immediately infused it into their leadership curriculum. However, the concept of community stressed in this model must continually be examined, as many forces continue to

THE PRIORITIES

impact the communities in which we live and lead. The massive globalization and technological advances have complicated the landscape. However this provides an opportunity to reexamine past theories as a foundation for the development of new models that empower change in diverse domestic and international contexts. Further, the economic downturn and climate change have considerably impacted industry and economic sustainability within rural and urban communities. Communities and the people within them have been forced to change industries, reinvent themselves, and often times relocate to support their viability within their social systems. As people leave their communities, economic stimulation lessens due to the lack of population causing rural flight and urban degradation.

Community resilience efforts create opportunities to figuratively and literally weather the storms associated with these new challenges. Community resilience, defined as “the existence, development, and engagement of community resources by community members to thrive in an environment characterized by change, uncertainty, unpredictability, and surprise” (Magis, 2010, p. 401), is possible through creative change management initiatives in complex adaptive systems. As leadership educators attempt to build capacity to address, initiate, and facilitate community resilience efforts, a solid foundation for the development of communities could potentially emerge from interdisciplinary efforts and the empowerment of socially responsible leadership (Dugan, 2006). Learners, who experience and have the opportunity for intentional reflection of community service and leadership development efforts, uncover the possibility of socially responsible leadership (Dugan, 2006). Further, the areas of rural sociology, community development, and non-profit leadership, along with other interdisciplinary perspectives will help leadership educators and their learners form perspectives that encourage accompaniment (Ausland, 2005; Andenoro and Bletscher, 2012), develop trust, and build adaptive capacity (Saavedra and Budd, 2009). These constructs have the potential to contribute to a deeper understanding of community change, resilience, and sustainability.

Challenges

Social change implies the indelible link between communities and their people. While human capital can be one of the most powerful assets in the leadership puzzle of community development, the variability within the human element can also serve to inhibit positive change and progress. This essentially forms the foundation for the challenges affecting Leadership Education within this priority. The following challenges provide considerations reflecting the inclusion of social change and community development perspectives with respect to the field of Leadership Education.

- **Understanding for Innovative Social Change** – Social change is becoming increasingly complicated as the complex adaptive systems that impact the likelihood of social change continue to evolve. Thus, new paradigms of social change that explore the cultural economic, social, and political dimensions of social change will be essential to empower change in the future. It is suggested that socially complex systems and the people within them form the foundation for research that will provide insight into how we can address social change and leadership development within communities. This implies both quantitative and qualitative measures aimed at understanding the feelings and perceptions of the community members and the issues they face.
- **Empowerment of Community Resilience** – Humans must learn to adapt to change, and resilience is a key component to successful adaptation and sustainable living (Saavedra and Budd, 2009). For leadership educators who aspire to develop community resilience and the capacity for community resilience

development in their learners, it is necessary to conduct research that provides an understanding for mitigation and adaptation strategies. These strategies should be focused on increasing the capacity of communities to adapt and live with change and surprises (Walker and Salt, 2006; Saavedra and Budd, 2009). Folke, Colding, and Berkes (2003) note that building resilience and adaptive capacity requires four elements: learning to live with change and uncertainty; nurturing diversity for reorganization and renewal; combining different types of knowledge for learning; and creating opportunities for self-organization. Researchers are urged to consider the role experiential learning plays and interdisciplinary knowledge as critical pieces of adaptive management capacity building. Gonzalez (2002) furthers this idea noting that adaptive management of complex systems is based on incremental learning and on decision-making, which are key components of the Leadership Education conundrum.

- **Examination of the Influence Relationship that Exists with Respect to Community Development**

– The meaning of citizenship has changed in recent years. In the past, citizenship could be likened to being a quality neighbor to those in a given area of town. However the expectations associated with this idea have shifted considerably. As an emergent term that alludes to a complex and adaptive process of empowering sustainability within domestic and global contexts, leadership educators are challenged to engage in research initiatives to explore the relationships that empower community development and citizenship. Specifically, the ideas of self-awareness, accompaniment, trust, intentionality, strategic direction, and sustainable change should be addressed.

Opportunities

Although significant challenges present themselves with respect to the complexity of social change and community development, the need and accompanying opportunities for research addressing this priority are evident. Through an intentional and interdisciplinary approach to the scholarship informing perspectives on social change and community development, Leadership Education stands on the precipice of what leaders are intuitively called to do - serve others and create opportunities for their empowerment. This priority is the foundation for tangible and applied leadership practice. It has the potential to manifest itself in the citizenship leading to sustainability and community empowerment through capacity building. It is the realization of the “teach a man to fish” proverb and accentuates the human capacity to work with one another to achieve synergistic successes.

PRIORITY SEVEN: Global and Intercultural Leadership

Applied Outcome – Global competence is increasingly a priority within higher education, and the development of global leadership knowledge and capacities are vital for the future of our global community. This priority encompasses a focused charge for the development of global and intercultural competence and increased understanding of leadership in a global context. Indelibly linked to the previous priority, global and intercultural leadership promotes and advances social change in international contexts, with respect to systems-based and complexity-based leadership frameworks. The following areas are recommended for exploration with respect to the development of global and intercultural competencies and capacities within leaders, followers, and learners.

- **The Development of the Intercultural Learner, Leader, and Follower** – The application of global leadership and the development of intercultural competence are essential to the development of organizations within global contexts. Thus, it is important for the research initiatives informing Leadership Education to reflect the global social structures that are defined by mutuality, respect, and justice and form the foundation for enhanced interactions and mutually beneficial intercultural relationships.
- **The Development of Global Organizations** – A global organization is an emergent term focusing on the intercultural processes that form foundations for organizations operating across international boundaries. However, the complexity of these intercultural processes should be examined more fully. Research addressing the social, political, historical, economic, and cultural considerations of global interactions and the organizational contexts where they take place will provide considerable opportunities for Leadership Educators attempting to develop intercultural competence in their learners and ultimately, provide a foundation for successful intercultural and global interactions at the organizational and community level.
- **The Development of the Intercultural Leadership Educator** – A number of global issues are influencing the field of Leadership Education. Leadership educators' must stay abreast of these global issues and incorporate them into the leadership curriculum. This of course takes a significant amount of time, energy, and work on behalf of the leadership educator. Thus, it is important that researchers address ways for leadership educators to develop their own global leadership knowledge and intercultural competence in order to then help develop the intercultural competence of the learners, leaders, and followers with which they work. Educational opportunities that provide a focus on global and intercultural knowledge and development can enable the development of the intercultural leadership educator.

Background/Foundation

The Association of American Colleges and Universities' Greater Expectations Project on Accreditation and Assessment reported that global knowledge and engagement, along with intercultural knowledge and competence, are essential learning outcomes for all fields of concentration and for all majors (McTighe and Musil, 2006). We suggest this is particularly relevant for Leadership Education. Political, economic, cultural, and social forces have made our society and lives increasingly more global in scope, and as such our focus on Leadership Education curricula requires globalization. This focused priority for globalization has moved from a competency-based organizational perspective to a renewed emphasis on capacity building within the individuals. Van Deurzen (1998) described the importance of intercultural competence noting that it provides an opportunity to be better strangers to each other and creates the foundation for a deeper understanding of each other and ourselves. Further, "through a deeper understanding of self and the predispositions and biases we possess, individuals can begin to deconstruct expectations and more fully engage in the opportunity to share culture and develop sustainable relationships in international contexts" (Andenoro, Popa, Bletscher, and Albert, 2012, p. 106).

With respect to the interface of global citizenship, democracy, and liberal learning, we appreciate that culture matters (Cornwall and Stoddard, 2001; Deardorff, 2006; Hovland, 2006; Meacham and Gaff, 2006; Stoddard and Cornwell, 2003). However, this creates a renewed challenge and opportunity for leadership educators. The daunting task of managing the complicated landscape of global dynamics requires new levels of preparedness and leadership. Thus, leadership educators are called to meet this challenge by developing quality curricula to address the need for intercultural capacity and globalized perspectives in the future leaders of our organizations.

Further, leadership educators need to consider that our world is becoming more and more complex and characterized by increased uncertainty. This merits the inclusion of systems-based and complexity-focused leadership frameworks (e.g. ecology models, adaptive leadership, chaos theories, learning organizations) to address the adaptive challenges we face in our organizations and in our global society. Many contemporary models of leadership are values-based and emphasize a focus on positive change, ethics, and/or social change (e.g. transforming leadership, servant leadership, relational leadership, social change model of leadership). As adaptive leadership challenges continue to affect the global community, it is important that we advocate for the question of "leadership for what?," emphasizing that leadership is values-based and involves making a positive impact organizations, communities, and global contexts.

There has been an increased focus on social entrepreneurship globally as well as within higher education, and research endeavors informing these should be considered. Globalization, and the technology that increasingly bridges countries and cultures, requires fresh paradigms and new leadership competencies (Bueno and Tubbs, 2004). Global managers will be expected to master an ever-expanding range of knowledge and skills that will allow them to be successful in international contexts (DiStefano and Maznevski, 2003). Although noted a decade ago, these perspectives are still timely. The idea of social entrepreneurship is evolving to meet the humanistic standards of international practice. Hence, in an effort to address the development of intercultural communities through humanistic means, leadership educators will be challenged to create innovative paradigms and practices along with educational curricula that will create the impetus for the development of future global leaders.

Challenges

Fully engrained in the systemic and cultural complexities of a global society, this priority offers considerable challenges to the leadership educator. However, through interdisciplinary and curricula/co-curricular collaborative efforts holistic means of addressing these challenges can be developed. The following challenges provide several considerations reflecting the inclusion of global and intercultural-based constructs with respect to the field of Leadership Education.

- **Development International Partnerships** – Data collection efforts in international contexts can be particularly difficult, as distance can inhibit our ability to assess, monitor, and evaluate the work and initiatives that are taking place. Further, growth and development is not always immediate and may develop over time complicating researchers ability to assess the impact of programs and initiatives. Thus, it is proposed that significant emphasis be placed on the development of collaborative partnerships with international constituents in an effort to create research teams both abroad and domestically to collect perspectives and engage in formative, summative, and developmental outcome-based evaluation.
- **Leadership Educator Resource Limitations** – Unfortunately, research in a global context can be more costly and time consuming. This inhibits the ability of leadership educators to develop international perspectives and share them with their learners. To address this, leadership educators are urged to look domestically for international perspectives. Interdisciplinary collaboration within higher education settings along with community populations, such as international refugees and international aid and development groups, may provide opportunities for research and the foundation for developmental curriculum aimed at addressing these deficiencies.
- **Tenuous Political Structures and Power Dynamics** – It is important to consider relationships and potential power dynamics that can arise in conducting research in a global context, particularly when crossing cultural and other social identity boundaries. Seeking research relationships that are reciprocal in nature can allow for mutually beneficial process and outcomes.
- **Rapid Evolution of Global Markets** – The global arena is constantly changing; political, economic, social, and cultural forces can significantly impact Leadership Education abroad and the research that can accompany it. Leadership educators are cautioned to consider that the rapid evolution of global markets calls for consistency of observation and identifies the tenuous shelf life of the “holistic” international perspective.
- **Current Frameworks for Immersive Opportunities** – Ideally for learners, leaders, and followers to gain intercultural competence, it can be beneficial to have international immersion experiences, such as study abroad trips and international service efforts. While there has been an increase in study abroad programs and other global experiences with a leadership focus, the programs and the research from these programs can be limited in scope. As society becomes more globally focused, there is a need for the advancement of learning opportunities grounded in the immersion trip. Leadership educators are charged with conducting research that will enhance the leadership curriculum through a renewed focus on the development of the learner and the international community he or she is working with.
- **Expansion of Understanding for Intercultural Competence** – Existing research on intercultural competence is relevant to many leadership concepts (e.g., self-awareness, awareness of others, diversity, values, perspectives), and there is opportunity to expand this further with a direct connection to Leadership Education and development. Research that informs the creation of curricula aimed at the expansion of intercultural competence and the ability to work effectively with other people across a variety of contexts and cultures is pivotal for enacting change that will empower the future of global citizenship.

Opportunities

Leadership Education is in many ways an American phenomenon, and, as such, Leadership Education strongly emphasizes Western (and more specifically American) conceptualizations of leadership. In fact, scholars from the mid 20th century emphasized “learning from the west” and “internationalization through colonial conquering” as the priorities of globalized curriculum (Baumgratz, 1995). Globalization within the practical sector was explored by and confined to very small, specialized operational departments within organizations (Morrison, 2000). These perspectives present unique challenges for leadership educators, but these ideas also convey boundless opportunities to further globalize Leadership Education. Expansion of current paradigms to include Eastern models of leadership provides different perspectives that can be valuable in helping not only understand other cultures, but also in broadening our focus and understanding on leadership. By focusing more on a global context when examining Leadership Education, we have an opportunity to expand and enhance our curriculum and understanding. Countless opportunities exist for educators to “practice what they preach” and to forge global relationships with other people committed to the same social issues or adaptive leadership challenges facing our global community. Through these relationships educators have the potential to develop capacity to address global issues and challenges, while designing curricula to empower those capacities in others.

In expanding our leadership focus to encompass systems-based and complex perspectives, there are opportunities to forge interdisciplinary collaborations with colleagues in fields across social sciences in addition to the hard sciences. Ultimately, these perspectives will form the foundation for enhanced learner development opportunities. The ability to understand oneself and those around him or her through a multiplicity of perspectives forms the foundation for successful intercultural interactions, as it allows for the cultivation of authentic and unbiased dialogue (Andenoro et al. 2012).

THE PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE AGENDA AND FUTURE STEPS

A Living Document – Understanding that Leadership Education is a constantly evolving and emergent body of knowledge, it is imperative to consider the National Leadership Education Research Agenda as a living document. The priorities and the perspectives within it provide direction for the Leadership Education scholarship and practice for the next five years. It is the desire of the leadership team and supporting organizations that the work of this agenda and the collaborative dialogue that informs it continue to develop and broaden the field of Leadership Education. These efforts form the foundation for deepened and more meaningful leadership learning experiences for the learners, leaders, and followers the field of Leadership Education serves.

The Priority Area Research Teams – In an effort to promote interdisciplinary and collaborative research aimed at addressing the research priorities included in this document, the Association of Leadership Educators (ALE) initiated Priority Research Area Teams (PARTs). During the announcement of the agenda in July of 2013 at the ALE Annual Conference, attendees had the opportunity to engage in collaborative dialogue with interdisciplinary colleagues interested in advancing the scholarship of Leadership Education. Conversations centered on the provided priorities and created organizational workgroups charged with informing the research priorities. PARTs are open to all interested parties and more detailed information can be found at the National Leadership Education Research Agenda page on the ALE website.

Future Agendas – The development team realizes that there two significant limitations of this agenda. First, the agenda was created under the auspice that future agendas will be necessary. The agenda is specifically designed to address the fundamental problems and issues within the broad context of Leadership Education that should be addressed at the higher education level through research in the next five years. It is the desire of the leadership team that a new agenda be presented every five years to inform the scholarship of Leadership Education with respect to the evolution of the field and society. Second, while transferability of the priorities to like contexts is permissible, international contexts and the international Leadership Education can potentially have a broad spectrum of priorities not addressed in this agenda. For this reason, the agenda was aptly named the National Leadership Education Research Agenda and finds application within the United States higher education system.



“Science requires an engagement with the world, a live encounter between the knower and the known.” -Parker Palmer

REFERENCES

- Allen, S. J., & Middlebrooks, T. (2013). The challenge of educating leadership expertise. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(4), 84-89.
- Allen, S. J. & Roberts, D. C. (2011). Our response to the question: Next steps in clarifying the language of leadership learning. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5 (2), 63-69.
- Allen, S. J., & Hartman, N. S. (2009). Sources of learning in student leadership development programming development programming. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(3), 6-16.
- Andenoro, A. C., & Bletscher, C. G. (2012). Transforming the international learning experience for students: Moving beyond the principle of accompaniment. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(1), 52-57.
- Andenoro, A. C., Popa, A. B., Bletscher, C. G., & Albert, J. (2012). Storytelling as a vehicle for self-awareness: Establishing a foundation for intercultural competency development. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(2), 102-109.
- Andenoro, A. C., Murphrey, T. P., & Dooley, K. E. (2008). Globalizing leadership curriculum: A priority for the development of international leaders. *Journal of Business & Leadership: Research, Practice and Teaching*, 4(1), 87-94.
- Andenoro, A.C. (2005). *Competencies of leadership professionals: A national study of premier leadership degree programs*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1978). *Organizational Learning: A theory of action approach*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Arminio, J. L., Carter, S., Jones, S. E., Kruger, K., Lucas, N., Washington, J., & Scott, A. (2000). Leadership experiences of students of color. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 37(3), 184-198.
- Astin, A. W. (1997). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. & Astin, H. S. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change*. Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.
- Ausland, A. (2005). Staying for tea: Five principles for the community service volunteer. *Global Citizen*, 2, 5-15.
- Avolio, B. (2005). *Leadership development in balance*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

- Avolio, B., & Hannah, S. T. (2008). Developmental readiness: Accelerating leader development. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 60(4), 331-347.
- Ayman, R., & Korabik, K. (2010). Why gender and culture matter. *American Psychologist*, 65, 157-170.
- Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning--a new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change Magazine*, 27(6), 12-25.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Baumgratz, G. (1995). Language, culture and global competence: an essay on ambiguity. *European Journal of Education*, 30(4), 437-447.
- Boyer, E. L. (1997). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Brown, M. E., & Gioia, D. A. (2002). Making things click: Distributive leadership in an online division of an offline organization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4), 397-419.
- Brungardt, C. L. (1997). The making of leaders: A review of the research in leadership development and education. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 3(3), 81-95.
- Brungardt, C. L. (1998). The new fact of leadership: Implications for training educational leaders. *On the Horizon*, 6(1), 7-8.
- Bueno, C. M., & Tubbs, S. L. (2004). Identifying global leadership competencies: an exploratory study. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 5(2), 80-87.
- Burns, J. M. (1995). The crisis of leadership. In J. T. Wren (Eds.), *The leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages* (pp. 8-10). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Chaiklin, S. (2003). The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction. In Kozulin, A., Gindis, B., Ageyev, V. and Miller, S. (Eds.) *Vygotsky's educational theory and practice in cultural context* (pp. 39-64). Cambridge, England.: Cambridge University.
- Chambers, T. (1992). The development of criteria to evaluate college student leadership programs: A delphi approach. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33(4), 339-347.
- Chan, K. Y., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 481-498.

REFERENCES

- Conger, J. A. (1998). Qualitative research as the cornerstone methodology for understanding leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(1), 107-121.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2012). Student leadership programs. In *CAS professional standards for higher education* (8th ed.). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.cas.edu/getpdf.cfm?PDF=E86F4088-052E-0966-ADCB25F2A9FE7A70>
- Cornwall, G. H., & Stoddard, E. W. (2001). The future of liberal education and the hegemony of market values: Privilege, practicality, and citizenship. *Liberal Education*, 87(3), 6-15.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Chomsky, C. (1972). Stages in language development and reading exposure. *Harvard Educational Review*, 42, 1-33.
- Conger, J. (1992). *Learning to lead: The art of transforming managers into leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Day, D. V. (2011). Integrative perspectives on longitudinal investigations of leader development: From childhood through adulthood. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 561-571.
- Day, D. V., Harrison, M. M., & Halpin, S. M. (2009). *An integrative approach to leader development: Connecting adult development, identity, and expertise*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Deardorff, D. K. (Ed.). (2009). *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Densten, I. L., & Gray, J. H. (2001). Leadership development and reflection: What is the connection? *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 15, 119-124.
- DiStefano, J. J., & Maznevski, M. L. (2003). Developing global managers: Integrating theory, behavior, data and performance. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 3, 341-371.
- D'Netto, B., Bakas, F., & Bordia, P. (2008). Predictors of management development effectiveness: An Australian perspective. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 12(1), 2-23.
- Dorfman, P. W., & House, R. J. (2004). Cultural influence on organizational leadership: Literature review, theoretical rationale, and GLOBE project goals. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, and V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 51-73). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Drath, W. H. (2001). *The deep blue sea: Rethinking the source of leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Duch, B. J., Groh, S. E., & Allen, D. E. (2001). Why problem-based learning?: A case study of institutional change in undergraduate education. In B. J. Duch, S. E. Groh and D. E. Allen (Eds.), *The Power of Problem-Based Learning* (pp. 3-11). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Dugan, J. P. (2013). What is privileged in leadership texts: Differentiating between established works, popular press, and dominant narratives. *Concepts and Connections, 19*(2), 23-27.
- Dugan, J. P., Kodama, C. M., & Gebhardt, M. C. (2012). Race and leadership development among college students: The additive value of collective racial esteem. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 5*, 174-189.
- Dugan, J. P. (2011). Pervasive myths in leadership development: Unpacking constraints on leadership learning. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 5*(2), 79-84.
- Dugan, J. P., Komives, S. R., & Segar, T. C. (2008). College student capacity for socially responsible leadership: Understanding norms and influences of race, gender, and sexual orientation. *NASPA Journal, 45*(4), 475-500.
- Dugan, J. P. & Komives, S. R. (2007). *Developing leadership capacity in college students: Findings from a national study. A Report from the Multi- Institutional Study of Leadership*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Dugan, J. P. (2006). Involvement and leadership: A descriptive analysis of socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(3), 335-343.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chin, J. L. (2010). Diversity and leadership in a changing world. *American Psychologist, 65*, 216-224.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Eagly, A. H. (2005). Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: Does gender matter? *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 459-474.
- Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. T., & Tesch-Römer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review, 100*(3), 363-406.
- Ericsson, K. A., Prietula, M. J., & Cokely, E. T. (2007). The making of an expert-response. *Harvard Business Review, 85*, 146-147.
- Ewell, P. T. (2008). Assessment and accountability in America today: background and context. In V.M.H. Borden and G. Pike (Eds), *Assessing and accounting for student learning: Beyond the Spelling Commission* (New Directions for Institutional Research, Assessment Supplement 2007, pp. 7-18). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

REFERENCES

- Fassinger, R. E., Shullman, S. L., & Stevenson, M. R. (2010). Toward an affirmative lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender leadership paradigm. *American Psychologist, 65*, 216-224.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 1*(1), 64.
- Folke, C., Colding, J., & Berkes, K. (2003). Synthesis: building resilience and adaptive capacity in social-ecological systems. In F. Berkes, J. Colding, and C. Folke (Eds.), *Navigating social-ecological systems: building resilience for complexity and change*. (pp. 352–387). Boston, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Gagne, R. M. (1970). *The conditions of learning* (2nd ed.). Oxford, England: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Gardiner, R. A. (2011). A critique of the discourse of authentic leadership. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2*, 99-104.
- Glaser, R. & Chi, M. T. H. (1988). Overview. In M. T. H. Chi, R. Glaser, and M. Farr (Eds.), *The Nature of Expertise* (pp. xv-xxviii). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Goertzen, B. (2013). Assessment adrift: Review of the current state of assessment of academically based Leadership Education programs. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 6*(3), 55-60.
- Goertzen, B. (2009). Assessment in academic based Leadership Education programs. *Journal of Leadership Education, 8*(1), 148-62.
- Gonzalez, R. M. (2002). GIS-assisted joint learning: a strategy in adaptive management of natural resources. *SUI Technical Series, 3*, 15-39.
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*(4), 423-451.
- Haber, P. (2012). Perceptions of leadership: College students' understandings of the concept of leadership and differences by gender, race, and age. *Journal of Leadership Education, 11*(2), 26-51.
- Haber-Curran, P. & Tillapaugh, D. (2013). Leadership learning through student-centered and inquiry-focused approaches to teaching adaptive leadership. *Journal of Leadership Education, 12*(1), 92-116.
- Hannum, K. M., Martineau, J. W., & Reinelt, C. (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of leadership development evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Heifetz, R. A. & Laurie, D. L. (1997). The work of leadership. *Harvard Business Review, 75*, 124-134.

- Heifetz, R. A. & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1984). *The management of organizational behavior*, (4th ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development guidebook. Version III*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 184-200.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321-339.
- Hovland, K. (2006). *Shared futures: Global learning and liberal education*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- International Leadership Association (ILA). (2013). *Directory of leadership programs*. Retrieved from <http://www.ilanet.org/Resources/LPD/index.htm>.
- International Leadership Association (ILA). (2009). *Guiding questions: Guidelines for Leadership Education programs*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ila-net.org/communities/LC/GuidingQuestionsFinal.pdf>
- Jenkins, D. M. (2013). Exploring instructional strategies in student leadership development programming. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(4), 48-62.
- Jenkins, D. M., Freed, S. A., Hoover, K. F., & Satterwhite, R. (2012, October). *The guiding questions: A bridge across the leadership studies program great divide*. Workshop presented at the 14th Annual International Leadership Association Global Conference. Denver, CO.
- Jenkins, D. M. (2012a). *Relation of undergraduate leadership educators' perceived learning goals and use of instructional strategies*. Proceedings of the 2012 Association of Leadership Educators Conference, 127-142.
- Jenkins, D. M. (2012b). Exploring signature pedagogies in undergraduate Leadership Education. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 11(1), 1-27.
- Jenkins, D. M. & Cutchens, A. B. (2011). Leading critically: A grounded theory of applied critical thinking in leadership studies. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 10(2), 1-21.
- Jones, S. R., Choe Kim, Y., & Cilente Skendall, K. (2012). (Re-) framing authenticity: Considering multiple social identities using autoethnographic and intersectional approaches. *Journal of Higher Education*, 83, 698-723.
- Kellerman, B. (2012). *The end of leadership*. New York, NY: Harper.

REFERENCES

- Kezar, A. & Moriarty, D. (2000). Expanding our understanding of student leadership development: A study exploring gender and ethnic identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*, 55-69.
- Kirwan, C. & Birchall, D. (2006). Transfer of learning from management development programmes: Testing the Holton model. *International Journal of Training and Development, 10*(4), 252-268.
- Kodama, C. & Dugan, J. P. (2013). Leveraging leadership efficacy in college students: Disaggregating data to examine unique predictors by race. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 46*, 184-201.
- Komives, S. R. & Dugan, J. P. (2010). Contemporary leadership theories. In R. A. Couto (Ed.), *Political and civic leadership: A reference handbook* (pp. 109-125). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Komives, S. R., Owen, J. E., Longerbeam, S. D., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2005). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(6), 593-611.
- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T.R. (2013). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into practice, 41*(4), 212-218.
- Lichtenstein, B. B., Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., Seers, A., Orton, J. D., & Schreiber, C. (2006). Complexity leadership theory: An interactive perspective on leading in complex adaptive systems. *Emergence: Complexity and Organization, 8*(4), 2-12.
- Lord, R. G. & Hall, R. J. (2005). Identity, deep structure and the development of leadership skill. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 591-615.
- Lord, R. G. & Maher, K. J. (1991) *Leadership and information processing*. Boston, MA: Routledge.
- Mabey, C. (2012). Leadership development in organizations: Multiple discourses and diverse practice. *International Journal of Management Reviews*.
- Magis, K. (2010). Community resilience: an indicator of social sustainability. *Society and Natural Resources, 23*(5), 401-416.
- Marion, R. & Uhl-Bien, M. (2003). Complexity theory and Al-Qaeda: Examining complex leadership. *Emergence, 5*(1), 54-76.
- Marzano, R. J. & Kendall, J. S. (2007). *The new taxonomy of educational objectives* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Meacham, J. & Gaff, J. G. (2006). Learning goals in mission statements: Implications for educational leadership. *Liberal Education, 92*(1), 6.

- Morrison, A. J. (2000). Developing a global leadership model. *Human Resource Management, 39*(2-3), 117-131.
- Mumford, M. D., Friedrich, T. L., Caughron, J. J., & Antes, A. L. (2009). Leadership development and assessment: Describing and rethinking the state of the art. In K. A. Ericsson (Ed.), *The development of professional expertise: Toward measurement of expert performance and design of optimal learning environments* (pp. 84-107). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Munin, A. & Dugan, J. P. (2011). Inclusive design in leadership program development. In S. R. Komives, J. P. Dugan, J. E. Owen, W. Wagner, C. Slack, and Associates, *Handbook for student leadership development* (pp. 157-176). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Murphy, S. E. & Johnson, S. K. (2011). The benefits of a long-lens approach to leader-development: Understanding the seeds of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*, 459-470.
- Murphy, S.E. & Riggio, R.E. (Eds.). (2003). *The future of leadership development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- O'Dell, I. (2009). Assessment and accountability in higher education. *Educational Considerations, 37*(1), 4-7.
- Obolensky, N. (2010). *Complex adaptive leadership*. London, UK: Gower Publishing Company, Limited.
- Odom, S. F., Boyd, B. L., & Williams, J. (2012). Impact of personal growth projects on leadership identity development. *Journal of Leadership Education, 11*(1), 49-63.
- Ospina, S., & Foldy, E. (2009). A critical review of race and ethnicity in the leadership literature: Surfacing context, power and the collective dimensions of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 20*, 876-896.
- Owen, J. (2012). *Examining the design and delivery of collegiate student leadership development programs: Findings from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL-IS), a national report*. Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education.
- Owen, J. E. (2012). *Findings from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership institutional survey: A national report*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs. Retrieved from <http://leadershipstudymsl.files.wordpress.com/2012/03/msl-is-publication-final.pdf>
- Owen, J. E. (2009). A snapshot of collegiate leadership programs: Data and implications from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership Institutional Survey (MSL-IS). *Concepts and Connections, 16*(3). College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Pascarella, E. T. (2006). How college affects students: Ten directions for future research. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(5), 508-520.
- Pascarella, E. T. & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

REFERENCES

- Peck, E., Freeman, T., Six, P., & Dickinson, H. (2009). Performing leadership: Towards a new research agenda in leadership studies? *Leadership, 5*(1), 25-40.
- Perruci, G. & McManus, R. M. (2012). The state of leadership studies. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 6*(3), 49-54.
- Perruci, G. & Schwartz, S. W. (2002). *Leadership for what? A humanistic approach to leadership development*. Paper presented at the Art of Management and Organization Conference, King's College, London, United Kingdom, September 3-6, 2002.
- Riggio, R. E. & Mumford, M. M. (2011). Introduction to the special issue: Longitudinal studies of leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*, 453–456
- Riggio, R. E. (2008). Leadership development: The current state and future expectations. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 60*(4), 383–392
- Riggio, R. E., Ciulla, J., & Sorenson, G. (2003). Leadership Education at the undergraduate level: A liberal arts approach to leadership development. In S.E. Murphy and R.E. Riggio (Eds.). *The future of leadership development*. (pp. 223-236). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ritch, S. W. (2007). Guidelines for Leadership Education programs: From crossroads to sustainability. *Concepts and Connections: The Future of Leadership Education, National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs, 15*(3), 11–13.
- Ritch, S. W. (2013). Formalized program review: An evolution. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 6*(3), 61-66.
- Ritch, S. W., & Mengel, T. (2009). Guiding questions: Guidelines for Leadership Education programs. *Journal of Leadership Education, 8*(1), 216-227.
- Roberts, D. C. (2003). Crossing the boundaries in leadership program design. In C. Cherrey, J. J. Gardiner, and N. Huber (Eds.), *Building leadership bridges* (pp. 137-149). Greensboro, NC: North Carolina Press.
- Roberts, D. (Ed.). (1981). *Student leadership programs in higher education*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University/American College Personnel Association.
- Rost, J. C. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Saavedra, C. & Budd, W. W. (2009). Climate change and environmental planning: Working to build community resilience and adaptive capacity in Washington State, USA. *Habitat international, 33*(3), 246-252.
- Schraw, G. (1998). Promoting general metacognitive awareness. *Instructional Science, 26*, 113–125.
- Seemiller, C. & Murray, T. (in press). The common language of leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(1).

- Senge, P. M. (1997). The fifth discipline. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 1(3), 46-51.
- Shamir, B., Dayan-Horesh, H., & Adler, D. (2005). Leading by biography: Towards a life-story approach to the study of leadership. *Leadership*, 1(1), 13-29.
- Shepherd, A. & Cosgriff, B. (1998). Problem-based learning: A bridge between planning education and planning practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 17, 348-357.
- Skenes, R. E. & Honig, C. A. (2004). Pretest/posttest use of the Life Styles Inventory for outcomes assessment of a professional master's in managerial leadership program. *Group and Organization Management*, 29(2), 171-200.
- Sowcik, M. (2013). Exploring the legitimacy, maturity, and accountability of leadership studies programs: A movement toward "good" practices? *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(3), 47 -48.
- Sowcik, M., Lindsey, J. L., & Rosch, D. M. (2013). A collective effort to understand formalized program review. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(3), 67-72.
- Sowcik, M. (2012). A review and critique of guiding questions: Guidelines for Leadership Education programs. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 11(2), 192-213.
- Steiner, S. D. & Watson, M. A. (2006). The service-learning component in business education: The values linkage void. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 5(4), 422-434.
- Sternberg, R. A. (1995). A prototype view of expert training. *Educational Researcher*, 24(6), 9-17.
- Stoddard, E. W. & Cornwell, G. H. (2003). Peripheral Visions: Towards a Geoethics of Citizenship. *Liberal Education*, 89(3), 44-51.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tillapaugh, D. W. & Haber-Curran, P. (in press). At the intersection of leadership and learning: A self-study of using student-centered pedagogies in the classroom. *Educational Action Research*.
- van Deurzen, E. (1998). *Paradox and Passion in Psychotherapy: An Existential Approach to Therapy and Counseling*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- van Knippenberg, D., van Knippenberg, B., De Cremer, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2004). Leadership, self, and identity: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 825-856.
- Vroom, V. H. & Jago, A. G. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

REFERENCES

- Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(4), 298-318.
- Walker, B. & Salt, D. (2006). *Resilience thinking: sustaining ecosystems and people in a changing world*. Washington D.C.: Island Press.
- Yukl, G. & Mahsud, R. (2010). Why flexible and adaptive leadership is essential. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(2), 81.
- Yukl, G. (2009). Leading organizational learning: Reflections on theory and research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(1), 49-53.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Leadership Team

The following individuals were critical to the initiation and creation of the inaugural National Leadership Education Research Agenda. Their valued contributions, considerable time, and undeniable commitment to the field of Leadership Education is sincerely appreciated.

Anthony C. Andenoro, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Leadership Education
University of Florida

Scott J. Allen, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Management
John Carroll University

John P. Dugan, Ph.D.

Associate Professor, Higher Education
Loyola University Chicago

Matthew Sowcik, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Leadership Studies &
Director of Leadership Education
Wilkes University

Paige Haber-Curran, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor, Department of Counseling,
Leadership, Adult Education, & School Psychology
Texas State University-San Marcos

Daniel M. Jenkins, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Leadership & Organizational
Studies
University of Southern Maine, Lewiston-Auburn Col-
lege

Laura Osteen, Ph.D.

Director, Center for Leadership & Social Change
Florida State University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Contributors

The following individuals provided valued perspectives for the historical portion of the development effort. I sincerely wish to thank them for their support and respected opinions that helped to inform the National Leadership Education Research Agenda.

Susan R. Komives, Ph.D.

Professor Emerita
University of Maryland

Robert Colvin, Ph.D.

Dean, College of Social Sciences
Christopher Newport University

Edward W. Osborne, Ph.D.

Professor & Department Chair
Department of Agricultural Education &
Communication
University of Florida

John F. Elliot, Ph.D.

Professor & Head, Department of Agricultural
Leadership, Education, & Communications
Texas A&M University

Craig Slack, Ph.D.

Director, National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs
University of Maryland

Susan M. Fritz, Ph.D.

Interim Executive Vice President & Provost
University of Nebraska, Lincoln

Rick Rudd, Ph.D.

Community Viability Chair of Excellence,
Professor and Department Head
Department of Agricultural & Extension Education
Virginia Tech University

Development Assistance Team

The following individuals were instrumental in the collection of perspective with respect to Phases 1 and 2 of the development process. Their time and effort is sincerely appreciated.

Sarah A. Bush

University of Florida

Natalie Coers

University of Florida

Avery L. Culberston

University of Florida

Jaron L. Jones

University of Florida

Janna Magette

University of Florida

Supporting Organizations

The following organizations are noted as supporting organizations due to their belief in the fundamental need for and collaborative nature of the National Leadership Education Research Agenda. These organizations actively share the agenda with their organizational membership in an effort to promote collaborative dialogue and enhance the field of Leadership Education.

